



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,468	09/17/2003	Debasis Bagchi	IHEAL-01038US1	4351
23910	7590	11/03/2006	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			FLOOD, MICHELE C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1655	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/664,468	BAGCHI, DEBASIS
Examiner	Art Unit	
Michele Flood	1655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2006.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                            2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-38 and 51-70 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-38 and 58-70 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 51-57 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 03 February 2004 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/8/04.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election without traverse of Claims 51-57 in the reply filed on September 18, 2006 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-38 and 58-70 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on September 18, 2006.

**Claims 51-57 are under examination.**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 51-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 51 is rendered vague and indefinite by the term "extract" because this term, in and of itself, does not adequately delineate its metes and bounds. This term is best defined as a product-by-process since product-by-process claims are intended to define products which are otherwise difficult to define (and/or distinguish from the prior art). For example, is the extract obtained via extraction with water, a polar solvent, a non-polar solvent, an acid or base, a squeezed extract, or something else? In addition,

from what part(s) of the plant is the extract obtained? It is well accepted in the herbal art that extraction with one of various distinct solvents, as well as from particular parts of therapeutic plants, has a profound impact on the final product with respect to the presence, absence, amounts, and/or ratios of active ingredients therein and, thus, its ability to provide the desired functional effect(s) instantly claimed and/or disclosed. Since the extract itself is clearly essential to the claimed invention, the step(s) by which the claimed extract is obtained are also clearly essential and, therefore, must be recited in the claim language itself (i.e., as a product-by-process). Please note that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, critical limitations from the specification cannot be read into the claims (see, e.g., *In re Van Guens*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 PSPG2d 1057 (Ded. Cir. 1991)). Accordingly, without the recitation of all these critical limitations as set forth above, the claims do not adequately define the instant invention.

Claim 53, line 4, recites the abbreviation "equivalents gm/". Abbreviations in the first instance of claims should be expanded upon with the abbreviation indicated in parentheses. The abbreviations can be used thereafter. Appropriate correction is required.

All other cited claims depend directly or indirectly from rejected claims and are, therefore, also, rejected under U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for the reasons set forth above.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 54-57 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claims, or amend the claims to place the claims in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claims in independent form. In the instant case, the claim language following the preamble of the claims is directed to post-processing of the claim-designated composition wherein the composition is either administered at claim designated range dose amounts or administered as one of several claim-designated pharmaceutical forms. Such language, as the language following the preamble of the aforementioned claims, lends no patentable weight to the claimed subject matter of Applicant's instantly claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 51-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ochi (N).

Applicant claims a composition comprising two or more berry extracts, wherein the composition has a higher antioxidant capacity than any one berry extract used in the

composition. Applicant further claims the composition of claim 1, wherein the composition has a higher oxygen radical absorbance capacity than the oxygen radical absorbance capacity of any one berry extract used in the composition; wherein the composition has an oxygen radical capacity above 40 Troxol equivalents/gram fresh weigh basis; wherein the composition is administered in a range of approximately 18 to 27 milligrams per dose; wherein the composition is administered in pill, powder, liquid, food or beverage or drug form; wherein the composition is administered in foods or beverages at a concentration of approximately 0.001 to 25% by weight of the total weight of the food or beverage.

Ochi teaches the combining of a plurality of fruit extracts as grape and berry to obtain an anti-oxidizing juice extract composition having doubled or more anti-oxidizing capacity. At [0008], Ochi teaches a composition comprising black gooseberry juice (read herein as a berry extract) and raspberry juice (read herein as a berry extract); and, at [0014], Ochi teaches a composition comprising black gooseberry juice (read herein as a berry extract) and grape juice (read herein as a berry extract) having a higher antioxidant oxidant capacity and oxygen radical capacity than any one berry used in the making of the referenced composition.

Ochi does not expressly teach that any of the referenced compositions have a an oxygen radical capacity above 40 Troxol equivalents/gram fresh weigh basis. However, the compositions comprising the compositions taught by Ochi comprise one and the same ingredients taught by Applicant has having the claim-designated property. Therefore, an oxygen radical capacity above 40 Troxol equivalents/gram fresh weigh

basis is considered inherent to the composition taught by Ochi, absent clear and convincing evidence to the contrary.

The reference anticipates the claimed subject matter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michele Flood whose telephone number is 571-272-0964. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
MICHELE FLOOD  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Michele Flood  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1655

MCF  
October 28, 2006